

GEORGE O. SAILE & ASSOCIATES
28 DAVIS AVENUE
POUGHKEEPSIE, NY 12603.

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO:	FROM:
Examiner David Davis	Stephen B. Ackerman
DEPT:	DATE:
	March 7, 2005
COMPANY:	FAX NUMBER:
US Patent & Trademark Office	845 471 2064
FAX NUMBER:	PHONE NUMBER:
571 273 7572	845 452 5863
RE:	# OF PAGES (INCLUDE THIS COVER):
10/091,959	4
NOTES/COMMENTS:	

Dear Examiner Davis,

Per our conversation this morning, please see the attached Restriction response, which we just recently mailed to the US PTO.

With Best Regards,



Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg. No. 37,761

HT-01-032

March 4, 2005

To: Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn: Art Unit 2652 - David Donald Davis

From: George O. Saile, Reg. No. 19,572

28 Davis Avenue

Poughkeepsie, N. Y., 12603

Subject: | Serial No.: 10/091,959 03/06/02 |

Yun-Fei Li et al.

EASILY MANUFACTURED EXCHANGE BIAS
STABILIZATION SCHEME

| _ Art Group: 2652 David D. Davis _ |

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

This is in response to the Restriction or Election
Requirement in the Office Action dated 02/15/05. In that
Office Action, restriction was required to one of two stated

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class
mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on March 7, 2005.

Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg.# 37761

Signature/Date

 3/7/05

HT-01-032

Inventions under 35 U.S.C. 121. The Inventions stated are Group I - Claims 1-22 to a process, classified in Class 29, subclass 603.01 and Group II - Claims 23-39 to a magnetic read head, classified in Class 360, subclass 324.12.

Applicant provisionally elects to be examined the Invention described by the Examiner as Group I - Claims 1-22 drawn to a process classified in Class 29, subclass 603.01. This election is made with traverse of the requirement under 37 C.F.R.1.143 for the reasons given in the following paragraphs.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the Requirement for Restriction given in the Office Action. The Examiner gives the reason for the distinctness of the two inventions as (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different products or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP 806.05(f)). However, upon reading the product Claims against the process Claims one can readily see that the product Claims are directed to "a magnetic read head structure" and the process Claims are directed to "a process for manufacturing a magnetic read head structure", it is necessary to obtain claims in both the product and method claim language. The method Claims necessarily use the product and vice versa. The field of search must necessarily cover both the method class/subclass 29/603.01 and products class

HT-01-032

360/324.12 in addition to other related Classes and subclasses to provide a complete and adequate search. The fields of search for the Group I and Group II inventions are clearly and necessarily co-extensive. The Examiner's suggestion that "In the instant case, the magnetic read head, the product, can be made by a materially different process such as one that does not require "patterning and etching the structure down to a depth that is sufficient to penetrate said antiferromagnetic layer", is very speculative and really has nothing to do with the Claims as presented in this Patent Application. Further, it is respectfully suggested that these reasons are insufficient to place the additional cost of a second Patent Application upon the Applicants. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw this restriction requirement for these reasons.

Withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement and the Allowance of the present Patent Application is requested.

Sincerely,



Stephen B. Ackerman, Reg.# 37761